

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1-34 remain pending in the case. Claims 1-34 are rejected. Claims 1, 3, 14, 16, 23, 24 and 27-32 are amended herein. No new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Support for the amendments can be found in the instant specification at least at page 33, line 9, through page 34, line 24.

Claim Objections

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 1, 14, 27 and 29 are objected to as being unclear and that the phrase "to be transmitted" should be amended to read "transmitted". Applicants respectfully submit that claimed "enabling said cryptographic checksum for said plurality of said first data segments to be transmitted separately from said plurality of data packets" as recited in independent Claim 1, and the similar recitations of Claims 14, 27 and 29, is clear. In particular, Applicants submit that the claimed embodiments clearly recite that "data segments" are "to be transmitted", e.g., not yet transmitted. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 14, 27 and 29 are clear and thus overcome the objection.

103(a) Rejections - Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12, 13, 23-30 and 32-34

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12, 13, 23-30 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Secure Scalable Video Streaming for Wireless Networks" by Wee et al., hereinafter referred to as the "Wee" reference, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,669 by Miller et al., hereinafter referred to as the Miller reference. The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12, 13, 23-30 and 32-34 are patentable over the combination of Wee and Miller, for at least the following rationale.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A method for ensuring the integrity of data, comprising:
for a plurality of data packets comprising a plurality of first data segments and a plurality of second data segments, calculating a cryptographic checksum for said plurality of said first data segments, wherein said plurality of first data segments have a different priority than said plurality of second data segments; and enabling said cryptographic checksum for said plurality of said first data segments to be transmitted separately from said plurality of data packets.

Independent Claims 23, 27, 29 and 32 include similar recitations. Claims 2, 5-10, 12 and 13 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 24-26 that depend from independent Claim 23, Claim 28 that depends from independent Claim 27, Claim 30 that depends from independent Claim 29, and Claims 33 and 34 that depend from independent Claim 32 also include these recitations.

Applicants respectfully note that “[t]o establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations” (MPEP 2142). Applicants respectfully submit that Wee does not show or suggest “for a plurality of data packets comprising a plurality of first data segments and a plurality of second data segments, calculating a cryptographic checksum for said plurality of said first data segments, wherein said plurality of first data segments have a different priority than said plurality of second data segments” (emphasis added) as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wee is different from the claimed embodiments. Applicants understand Wee to describe a method of secure

scalable streaming (SSS) for wireless networks (Abstract). With reference to Section 4.1 and Figure 4, Wee recites that “the video data is segmented into tiles. Then, each tile is coded into two portions: header data and scalable video data. Next, the scalable video data is encrypted with progressive encryption techniques” (Section 4.1). In particular, Applicants understand Wee to disclose that all video data is segmented, coded and encrypted in the same manner.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wee does not teach, describe or suggest “calculating a cryptographic checksum for said plurality of said first data segments, wherein said plurality of first data segments have a different priority than said plurality of second data segments” as claimed. Applicants respectfully submit that Wee discloses that all scalable video data is processed in the same manner. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Wee does not teach, describe or suggest operating on one portion of the scalable video data differently than another portion of the scalable video data.

Applicants respectfully submit that Miller does not overcome the shortcomings of Wee. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Miller also does not teach, describe or suggest “calculating a cryptographic checksum for said plurality of said first data segments, wherein said plurality of first data segments have a different priority than said plurality of second data segments” as claimed.

As understood by the Applicants, Miller discloses that “[o]ther prior art systems provide similar reliability checks by applying the well-known parity, checksum and CRC (cyclic redundancy checking) functions to the outgoing and incoming messages (emphasis added; col. 1, lines 38-42). Applicants respectfully submit that Miller discloses that a checksum is applied to a

message without regard to a priority, or that different messages are treated differently with regard to application of a checksum.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Miller also does not teach, describe or suggest "calculating a cryptographic checksum for said plurality of said first data segments, wherein said plurality of first data segments have a different priority than said plurality of second data segments" as claimed. Moreover, Applicants submit that by disclosing that a checksum is applied to a message without regard to a priority, Miller teaches away from such an embodiment.

Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Wee and Miller does not teach, disclose or suggest the claimed embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 23, 27, 29 and 32, that this claim overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Wee and Miller also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 2, 5-10, 12 and 13 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 24-26 that depend from independent Claim 23, Claim 28 that depends from independent Claim 27, Claim 30 that depends from independent Claim 29, and Claims 33 and 34 that depend from independent Claim 32. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 5-10, 12, 13, 24-26, 28, 30, 33 and 34 also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

103(a) Rejections - Claims 3, 4, 11, 14-22 and 31

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 3, 4, 11, 14-22 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wee in view of

Miller, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0095586 by Doyle et al., hereinafter referred to as the Doyle reference. The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 3, 4, 11, 14-22 and 31 are patentable over the combination of Wee, Miller and Doyle, for at least the following rationale.

Claims 3, 4 and 11 are dependent on independent Claim 1 and includes the recitations of Claim 1 and Claim 31 is dependent on independent Claim 29. Hence, by demonstrating that Wee, Miller and Doyle do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 1 and 29, it is also demonstrated that Wee, Miller and Doyle do not show or suggest the embodiments of Claims, 3, 4, 11 and 31.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Wee and Miller does not teach, describe or suggest the recitations of independent Claims 1 and 30. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Wee and Miller does not teach, describe or suggest the similar recitations of independent Claim 14.

Applicants respectfully submit that Doyle does not overcome the shortcomings of the combination of Wee and Miller. As understood by the Applicants, Doyle discloses a technique for continuous user authentication. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Doyle also does not teach, describe or suggest "calculating a cryptographic checksum for said plurality of said first data segments, wherein said plurality of first data segments have a different priority than said plurality of second data segments" as claimed. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Doyle is silent to such a teaching.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Doyle shares at least some of the shortcomings of Wee and Miller. Thus, Doyle, alone or in

combination with Wee and/or Miller, does not show or suggest the embodiments as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Wee, Miller and Doyle does not teach, disclose or suggest the claimed embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 14 and 29, that this claim overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Wee, Miller and Doyle also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 3, 4 and 11 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 15-22 that depend from independent Claim 14, and Claim 31 that depends from independent Claim 29. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3, 4, 11, 15-22 and 31 also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-34 overcome the rejections of record, and therefore Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Date: 10/31/2007


John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Westridge Business Park
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 377-0500
Facsimile: (831) 763-2895